

a fully committee has waylaid many who were the recipients of less fervent missives from Earl Browder. We fear that Mr. Hull's days in office are numbered. Creel's superficial foray into State Department press agency rarely rises above the level of attributing the attacks on Hull to a Red plot, embracing not only such notoriously weak-minded liberals as the editors of *The Nation* but even such stalwarts as those of the New York *Herald Tribune*. In some secret center, according to Mr. Creel, sits Fu Manchu Browder, devising diabolic stratagems, but none more daring or dastardly than this latest honeyed attempt at downright character assassination.

*

REPRESENTATIVE MAY DOUBTLESS FELT THAT he was upholding the honor of the white race when he prevailed upon the War Department not to use the Public Affairs Pamphlet "The Races of Mankind" in its orientation courses. Mr. May's specific objection to the pamphlet appears to have been a reference to the intelligence tests given by the American army in 1917 in which Northern Negroes from certain states made higher median scores than Southern whites from Mississippi, Kentucky, and Arkansas. The pamphlet goes on to explain that these differences "did not arise because people were from the North or the South, or because they were white or black, but because of difference in income, education, cultural advantages, and other opportunities." Since Mr. May does not challenge the accuracy of the test, and can hardly be expected to contend that the poor showing of the Southern whites was due to any innate inferiority in comparison to either Northern whites or Negroes, his position is simply one of trying to keep the truth from our soldiers. In thus forbidding the presentation of scientific facts which utterly refute Nazi and Japanese theories of race superiority, Mr. May, as chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, is holding off from our soldiers the weapons by which they can defend themselves in the war for men's minds—a war that is even more important in Nazi strategy than the struggle for islands and beachheads.

A Revolting Necessity

BERLIN, subjected to an increasingly heavy battering over a period of months by the R. A. F. night bombers, has now experienced a rapid succession of massive daylight attacks by the American Eighth Air Force. There are signs that the enemy defenses are being smothered and that the Germans are preparing to abandon the city and evacuate the remaining population. If this happens, the Anglo-American air forces will have won a victory the significance of which can hardly be exaggerated. Berlin is of major importance to the German

war effort as a center of production, as the hub of the whole transportation system, and as the seat of a highly centralized bureaucracy. The loss in administrative efficiency alone caused by the scattering of government offices is not a factor to be dismissed lightly.

Yet at the moment when Anglo-American air power appears to be approaching its apex of effectiveness, the whole policy of mass strategic bombing is being sharply challenged both here and in Britain. Its military results, it is claimed, cannot justify the appalling suffering that our terrific assault from the skies is inflicting on German noncombatants. This is the gist of the case made in a pamphlet "Massacre by Bombing" written by the well-known English author, Vera Brittain, and published in this country by the Fellowship of Reconciliation with the indorsement of a group of religious leaders and Oswald Garrison Villard.

The pamphlet, which gives a detailed but hardly objective or reliably documented account of the effects of raids on German cities, makes ugly reading. No one with imagination can contemplate the results of a rain of fire and high explosives on crowded streets with any complacency. And in so far as Miss Brittain's protest is directed against the indecent gloating with which the bombings are too often reported, it has our deep sympathy. We can agree, too, in dismissing the argument that the raids are justified as a means of paying back the Germans in their own coin for their murderous attacks on Warsaw, Rotterdam, London, and a host of other cities. As Miss Brittain says: "Retaliation in kind and worse means the reduction of ourselves to the level of our opponents."

Even if we could accept the theory that the total guilt of Germany deserves total punishment, we still have to remember the ten million foreign slaves in the country. They probably furnish an unduly large share of the casualties since they are forced to stay near their work and are often housed on factory premises. Nor can we forget that the bombing of military objectives often brings death to our friends in occupied countries. In this connection, political results sometimes seemed to have been weighed too lightly against military considerations. The heavy bombing of northern Italy last year, at a time when the Italian workers were rising against fascism, is difficult to defend on strategic grounds.

Nevertheless, when all is said, we still cannot accept Miss Brittain's proposition that "nothing less than absolute certainty" that mass bombing will shorten the war justifies its employment as a weapon. To order the kind of warfare we are waging is, indeed, a dreadful responsibility. But who is ready to take the responsibility of ordering its abandonment? "The whole of this air offensive," Mr. Churchill said in his last speech, "constitutes the foundation on which our plans for overseas invasion stand." The outline of our present strategy is not hard

to trace. Prior to assaulting Fortress Europe we are endeavoring to knock the Luftwaffe out of the skies and to prevent its reinforcement. Concentrated attacks on German fuel supplies and communications will probably follow. For by these means we can hope to offset the advantages the enemy derives from his defensive preparations. Under any circumstances, the invasion of Europe must be a costly undertaking. Making their way to the shore through acres of minefields, our men will have to storm bitterly contested beaches and a network of concrete fortifications bristling with every deadly weapon. Having established beachheads they must anticipate savage counter-attacks made by a highly mobile enemy, commanding large strategic reserves. Before they tackle these tasks, can we, dare we, neglect any means of reducing the German ability to resist? Quite apart from the lives that would be sacrificed by such a policy, we have to take into consideration what failure will mean in terms of prolonging the war and the agony of millions under the Nazi heel.

Deprived of the weapon of mass bombing our armies might easily be so handicapped that the war would be stalemated. That, perhaps, is what the protesters have in view, for what they are really attacking is not a weapon of war but war as a weapon. But, hating war, the peoples of the United Nations hate the alternative—Nazi domination—still more. And because they do so they will not shrink from "the revolting necessity"—to use the words of Bishop C. Bromley Oxnam—of obliteration bombing of German cities.

Post-War Education

PERSONS who are interested in the probable direction of American educational development after the war would do well to study the report which the New York Board of Regents submitted to the 1944 state legislature some weeks ago. In general, it is an interesting and heartening program. The Board of Regents envisions a very considerable expansion in the state's educational facilities from the kindergarten through college.

Unique from an educational viewpoint is the plan to establish twenty-two new two-year colleges, to be called institutes, to provide technical training for students who, for one reason or another, would not normally attend college. Present plans call for the setting up of such institutes specializing in technical fields like agriculture, aviation, the graphic arts, industrial arts, automotives, science, food occupations, machines and metals, and communications. Plans have also been drawn up for the creation of an Institute of Public Service Training at Albany for the training of state and local government employees, and an Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at a site yet undetermined.

These institutes will fill an important gap in American public education. Although similar to junior colleges in many respects, they will offer a much more concrete and practical curriculum and thus should attract many students who otherwise would discontinue their education after finishing high school. In addition to providing needed technical courses, these institutes will stress citizenship training and offer a wide range of cultural subjects. It is hoped that through night courses and other special arrangements they can be made available not only to high-school graduates desiring specialized training but to persons of any educational background.

The Regents' plan also calls for a very large expansion in the system of free scholarships for college students. Instead of 750 scholarships worth \$100 a year, as at present, 12,000 scholarships will be offered worth \$350 a year. The seeming generosity of this proposal is offset, however, by the fact that New York is one of the few states that does not maintain a state university with free tuition for residents. Even if the Regents' proposal is adopted, only one-tenth of the 120,000 boys and girls graduated from the state's high schools each year will be able to obtain free tuition in a regular college at the state's expense. New York's backwardness in this respect is recognized by the Regents, who point out that at present the state's per capita expense for higher education is among the lowest in the country—43 cents as against a national average of \$1.15.

The Regents' post-war program is not limited to higher education. A further consolidation of school districts is urged for country areas, and additional state aid is proposed to provide more kindergartens and to develop counseling services and adult education. All these steps are significant because they appear to chart the main channels of post-war educational development. The need for retraining millions of service men and war workers for peace-time occupations will unquestionably lead to a new emphasis on technical and vocational training and adult education throughout the country. The New York program anticipates this need and provides a practical way of meeting it.

The most glaring omission in the Regents' proposals is their failure to provide for the development of a work-study program that would enable young people of limited financial ability to continue their studies in secondary school and above. Even with the increased scholarships, thousands of superior students will be barred from the benefits of higher education unless special arrangements are made to help them earn their own way. Such a program should probably be financed by the federal government rather than the states, as, indeed, the National Resources Planning Board recommended. But in the absence of federal action, the responsibility for this basic step toward providing real equality in educational opportunity obviously rests with the states.

A

F
wa
enemi
pandit
The p
crisis,
so ine
hope

The

way it
radio.

with

far o

fender

don't

dema

ogniti

by de

felt or

policy

ments

tion w

exile

minds

edly u

of Ba

Italian

ernme

tors. C

censor

they a

to wit

shall

merely

that w

The

raw, i

Other

many.

Polan

that w

Hull

Mosco

as tre

words

lems

The

of any

appare

the se

bridge